

REMARKS

Applicant has canceled claims 1-32 and added new claims 33-45. Accordingly, only claims 33-45 remain in the application, of which none have been allowed.

Applicant affirms his election of the Examiner's group II which includes claims 10-17, 25-27 and 29-32. New independent claims 33, 38 and 41 describe the same invention as was described in the elected claims.

New claim 33 is similar to now-canceled claim 12. Claim 33 basically describes a telescoping piston such as shown in applicant's Fig. 2, which includes outer and inner piston parts (64, 66). This minimizes the height of the actuator. One example of where this is useful is in enabling more patient-holding stretchers to be stacked in an ambulance that responds to a disaster.

Claim 12 (similar to 33) was rejected on Arpin (4,702,231) in view of Nowakowski (5,327,887). Arpin shows a chest compressor powered by an electric motor, and that is indicated as having a single piston part. Nowakowski shows, in his Fig. 7 a device for compressing a patient's chest, which includes a crank shaft 31 that reciprocates a plunger 38. The plunger engages the top of a key 49 to pushdown a thumper shaft 48 that presses down a thumper 71.

In Nowakowski, the top of his thumper shaft 48 (Fig. 7) is fixed to a ventilation piston 40 that compresses air in a ventilation chamber 80 to force air out of a valve 56 and through a tube 27 to a reservoir 23 (Fig. 4) that flows air to the patient. His ventilation piston 40 (Fig. 7). While new claim 33 describes at least two piston parts (e.g. 64, 66 in applicant's Fig. 2) that telescope one into the other, Nowakowski shows only a single piston part (that includes 48 and 40 that are fixed together). Accordingly, applicant believes that new claim 33 and dependent claims 34-37 should be allowed.

New claim 38 is similar to claim 33 in describing telescoping piston parts.

As discussed above, Nowakowski does not show this. Accordingly, applicant believes that new claims 38 and dependent claims 39-40 should be allowed.

New claim 41 which is similar to now-canceled claim 29, describes a method which includes controlling an actuator to apply downward forces to a patient's chest. The method comprises applying downward forces during only 10% to 30% of each cycle. Original claim 29 was rejected on Kelly (5,738,637).

The Examiner referred to column 12, lines 24-30 of Kelly, which describes the possibility of applying a "short duration, high intensity force to the chest". Kelly implies that this is an alternative to "a long duration application of force" (col. 12, l. 29). Applicant's lower limit of 10% of the entire cycle assures that the actuator does not move down in a short pulse, which could harm the patient. Accordingly, applicant believes that new claim 41 and dependent claims 42-45 should be allowed.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration of the application is courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Leon D. Rosen
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 21,077

10960 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 1220
Los Angeles, CA 90024
(310) 477-0578